DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 361 733 CS 214 028

AUTHOR Schierhorn, Ann B.; Endres, Kathleen L.

TITLE Magazine Editors and the Writing Process: An Analysis of How Editors Work with Staff and Free-Lance Writers.

PUB DATE Aug 93

NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (76th, Kansas City, MO, August 11-14, 1993).

PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Editing; Editors; *Education Work Relationship; Higher Education; *Journalism; Journalism Education; National Surveys; News Writing; Periodicals; Writing Instruction; Writing Processes

IDENTIFIERS Journalism Research; Process Approach (Writing)

ABSTRACT

Editors of business and consumer magazines chosen by a random sample were asked in a mail survey what method they used in working with staff writers and free-lance writers. They were asked how they work with writers in the five stages of the writing process--idea, reporting, organizing, writing and rewriting. The first mailing to consumer publications provided 77 responses and a follow-up questionnaire yielded 23 responses. These 100 responses yielded 97 usable surveys, or a 59% response rate. The survey showed respondents used an "ad hoc" method of working on stories. This differs from the process method of writing instruction, which is the dominant teaching method in the magazine journalism classroom and has been embraced by the newspaper industry under the name of coaching. Editors also were asked to what extent they involve writers in a creative team, a cooperative effort by writers, editors, photographers, artists and designers who collaborate on the most effective way to tell the story. The survey showed that these editors had not embraced the creative team approach, even though it is promoted at industry conferences. (Contains 9 data tables and 20 references.) (Author/NH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 361 733

Abstract

Magazine Editors and the Writing Process: An Analysis of How Editors Work with Staff and Free-Lance Writers

By Ann B. Schierhorn, Assistant Professor, Kent State University and Kathleen L. Endres, Associate Professor, University of Akron

Presented to the Magazine Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Aug. 1993, Kansas City, MO

Editors of business and consumer magazines chosen by a random sample were asked in a mail survey what method they used in working with staff writers and free-lance writers. They were asked how they work with writers in the five stages of the writing process -- idea, reporting, organizing, writing and rewriting. The survey showed respondents used an *ad hoc* method of working on stories. This differs from the process method of writing instruction, which is the dominant teaching method in the magazine journalism classroom and has been embraced by the newspaper industry under the name of coaching. Editors also were asked to what extent they involve writers a creative team, a cooperative effort by writers, editors, photographers, artists and designers who collaborate on the most effective way to tell the story. The survey showed that these editors had not embraced the creative team approach, even though it is promoted at industry conferences.

CS214028

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Schierhorn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Magazine Editors and the Writing Process: An Analysis of How Editors Work with Staff and Free-lance Writers

Ann B. Schierhorn
Assistant Professor
Kent State University
School of Journalism
and Mass Communication
130 Taylor Hall, Kent, OH 44242
(216) 672-2572

Kathleen L. Endres
Associate Professor
School of Communication
University of Akron

Presented to the Magazine Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication at the annual convention, Kansas City, MO, August 1993.

Magazine Editors and the Writing Process: An Analysis of How Editors Work with Staff and Free-lance Writers

The writing process approach has been used in the composition classroom for 20 years, and it is widely used in journalism schools in teaching magazine writing. It was introduced to the newspaper industry through the arrival of "writing coaches," editors or consultants who have been hired in the past 15 years to work with reporters and copy editors.[1] Despite the acceptance of this method in the classroom and in the newspaper industry, little is known about how, or if, the writing process method is used in the magazine industry.

This study looks at how editors work with writers on professional magazines.

Literature Review

Most of the literature about the editor-writer relationship on magazines is anecdotal and much of that is about the *New Yorker*. Thurber's biography (1957) described how the magazine's first editor, Harold Ross, nurtured writers. Ross' successor, William Shawn, was portrayed as an editor whose great strength lay in polishing manuscripts (Pace, 1992). And a close writer-editor relationship for fine-tuning manuscripts was outlined in a videotape (1986) on the *New Yorker*. Writers such as John McPhee and Ann Beattie and editor Roger Angell described editing sessions in which every adjective and every comma are considered.

Beyond these sources, much of the literature is in textbooks. Click and Baird (1990) discussed the role of the editor in evaluating manuscripts for audience, angle, reporting, focus, structure and literary quality. They pointed out that it is typical for a manuscript to go through revision before publication and that the editor needs to guide the writer through this process. Although Click and Baird devoted much of their attention to how the editor works with a completed manuscript, they also pointed to the editor's role in helping the writer to massage the idea before reporting.

Jacobi (1991) in his book, which serves both as a text for journalism students and a handbook for magazine writers, presented case studies of the writer-editor relationship. The writer-editor pairs for *Playboy* and *Restaurants & Institutions* collaborated from the conception of the idea through the final drafts of the article.

In a book for both professional journalists and for the classroom, Clark and Fry (1992), promoted consultative editing by showing ways that editors and reporters could collaborate throughout the writing process in the newsroom. Their book was the culmination of 15 years of change on newspapers as writing coaches brought techniques used by composition instructors, especially the one-on-one conference, into the newsroom. This change was reflected in smaller ways in other textbooks. Berner's newspaper copy editing text (1991) devoted a chapter to consultative editing.

In a 1991 study, Schierhorn and Endres determined that the writing process, or collaborative, approach urged by Clark and Fry, had become the dominant approach in teaching magazine journalism. This approach called for close interaction between student and teacher at each step in the writing process. A related study (Endres and Schierhorn, 1992) found both men and women favored this approach.

In addition to urging a close working relationship between editors and writers, experts in the industry have been urging collaboration of writers, editors, photographers and designers, called the creative team. Paul (1991), a national consultant for magazines, called for a close creative relationship between editors and designers to achieve the most effective presentation of a story in words and in visual display.

In a presentation for a Folio: Washington, D.C. conference, Covey (1992) described how editors, writers, photo editor, art director and researchers worked together as a creative team on *U.S. News & World Report* to plan how a story would be told. A story was written to a line length, design was begun before the story was completed, and a sidebar was turned into a graphic. At *National Geographic World*, a children's magazine, a designer, a picture editor

and a researcher teamed up for each story (Green, 1992). Stories were short blocks of type written in the layout software program.

The editor of a Sunday magazine (Stamell, 1990) described how a strict design format and story content format helped her to coach writers at her magazine. The design format imposed a word limit and the story content format determined which stories were multiple-source, trend stories and which were advice stories. Click and Baird too pointed to the editor's role in anticipating and shaping the visual presentation of the story.

Two studies have reported on surveys asking about the collaborative approach on newspapers. In an exploratory study designed to identify newspaper writing coaches, ask about methods and explore issues (Laakaniemi, 1987), found coaches surveyed said a lack of discussion between reporters and editors created serious writing problems for many reporters. Another study of newspaper writing coaches (Wolf and Thomason, 1986) showed the coaches surveyed believed that one-on-one conferences with writers were the most effective technique for improving writing.

What is not clear from the textbooks, case studies and other literature is how editors are working with writers and how writers are working with other members of a creative team across a variety of consumer and specialized business magazines. This study examines those issues.

Method

To determine the writer-editor relationship in the magazine industry, researchers developed a 42-item questionnaire. The questionnaire, which was sent to supervisory editors in a sampled group of magazines, attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. Who is the editor?
2. What methods of editing do magazine editors use in working with writers?
3. Why does the editor use the method he or she does?

4. How is the editor using the method?

5. How are staff or free-lance writers interacting with other members of a creative team?

6. Has the use of free-lance writers changed in the past five years?

Two Standard Rate and Data volumes, *Consumer Magazine and Agri-Media Rates and Data* (March 1992) and *Business Publication Rates and Data* (April 1992), were used to draw the sample of consumer and specialized press editors who received the mailed questionnaire. SRDS volumes were selected for the sample because they constituted one of the most complete listings of U.S. periodicals with advertising, they were readily available, and they had been used successfully in earlier studies (Kobak, 1993; Abrahamson, 1991; Kobak, 1990). Researchers have cited some of the limitations of these volumes in the past. Those include the fact that SRDS volumes are not all-encompassing. They fail to list most recently launched periodicals, adless periodicals and those with only a limited advertising base.

In this study, the researchers used a random number as the starting point and then included each 10th periodical in the sample. In determining the 10th periodical, duplicate listings of a periodical, show publications, annual buyer's guides or directories, and entertainment programs were excluded.[2]

Originally, agri-media and health periodicals were to be a part of this study, but they were eliminated from the sample. The agri-media listings in SRDS include only about 250 names, so a 10 percent sample would have provided too few responses for meaningful analysis. Health publications, which were more numerous, presented a different problem. A substantial number of these were refereed journals, but that status was not clear from the SRDS listings. Because this study was not intended to cover refereed journals, health publications were excluded from the findings and analysis. The sample drawn by this method included 164 consumer magazines and 296 specialized business magazines.

The questionnaire was written to mirror as much as possible an earlier survey of magazine educators, who were asked how they work with student writers in the writing process (Schierhorn and Endres). The researchers attempted to ask professional editors questions that would elicit responses about the same issues, but the researchers used the terminology of the industry, rather than that used in education. One of the researchers attended a national Magazine Publishing Conference to check the terminology and practices asked about in the questionnaire against current usage in the industry. After the questionnaire was drafted, it was pretested on a small sample of magazine professionals. Those results were used to revise the instrument before it was mailed.

The survey was mailed over a two-month period in early 1993. Consumer magazine editors were mailed questionnaires in the first two weeks of January 1993; those who did not respond were sent follow-up questionnaires in early February. Editors of specialized business publications were mailed questionnaires in the last two weeks of January, with follow-up questionnaires in mid-February.

The first mailing to consumer publications provided 77 responses, and the follow-up yielded 23. These 100 responses yielded 97 usable surveys, or a 59 percent response rate.

The first mailing to specialized business publications brought 129 responses. The second mailing yielded 34. These 163 responses[3] represented a 51 percent response rate.

Results and Discussion

Research Question 1: Who is the editor?

The editors who responded to the survey supervised staff and/or free-lance writers. In comparing business and consumer magazines, the study showed no statistical differences between the two categories of editors. The two groups of editors were similar in age, education, journalistic experience, editing experience and gender distribution. The mean age for business editors was 40.9, for consumer editors, 41.6. In educational attainment, 86.9 percent of the business editors held bachelor's or master's degrees; 80.3 percent of the

consumer editors had these degrees. Some editors reported they held other degrees (7.2 percent of the consumer editors and 5.9 percent of the business editors). The majority of those had doctorates or had completed course work toward doctorate degrees. Consumer editors had slightly more journalistic experience -- 15.4 years compared to 14.7 for business editors. Editors in both groups had substantial experience in editing, but consumer editors also held the edge here. Consumer editors averaged 11.7 years of editing experience, while business editors averaged 9.3 years.

Although business and consumer editors share certain similarities, the magazines they work for differ markedly. In the makeup of the editorial department, for example, the consumer editor can expect to work with more staff writers: 3.9, compared to 3.4 on business magazines. The consumer editors also work with a larger battery of free-lancers: 19.4, compared to 10.1 for business magazines.

The size of the magazine (as defined by circulation) itself is apt to be quite different. The circulation of consumer magazines whose editors responded is significantly larger than the circulation of business magazines.

Table 1

Circulation by Type of Magazine

	Consumer	**Business**
Less than 25,000	16 (16.5%)	82 (54.3%)
25,000-74,999	26 (26.8%)	47 (31.1%)
75,000-199,999	28 (28.9%)	17 (11.3%)
200,000+	27 (27.8%)	5 (3.3%)

X2=59.849415, df=3, p<.001

The majority of the business magazines had circulations of less than 25,000. In contrast, the consumer magazines had roughly equal numbers across all the circulation

categories. Indeed, the smallest number (N=16, or 16.5%) of consumer magazines had circulations of less than 25,000.

The distribution of men and women in both groups also was similar. Male editors outnumbered female editors almost 2 to 1 in each group. In consumer magazines, 60.8 percent of the respondents were men (59 men and 38 women, or 39.2 percent); in business magazines, 61.8 percent of the respondents were men (94 men and 58 women, or 38.2 percent).

The female editors who responded to the survey tended to be younger (37.8 years compared to 43.3 years for men),[4] with more education (89.6 percent had at least a bachelor's degree compared to 81 percent of the men),[5] with less experience as a professional journalist (12.3 years compared to 16.9 years for men),[6] and less editing experience (6.6 years compared to 10.5 years for men).[7]

The findings that female editors were younger and less experienced as journalists and as editors appeared to have an impact on their role in the workplace where female editors supervised fewer staff writers (3.1 compared to 3.8 for men)[8] and fewer free-lancers (12.6, compared to 14.4 for men). Women were also found to be working on publications with smaller circulations. (See Table 2.)

Table 2

Magazine Circulation by Gender of Editor

	Male		**Female**	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Circulation Size				
Under 25,000	59	38.8	39	40.6
25,000-74,999	42	27.6	31	32.3
75,000-199,999	37	24.3	8	8.3
200,000+	14	9.2	18	18.8

X2=13.001078, df=3, p<.01

Research Question 2: What methods of editing do magazine writers report they use in working with writers?

In the survey, editors were asked to characterize their method of working with staff writers and working with free-lance writers. These questions were asked to determine whether the editors used a product-oriented approach, giving an assignment and editing the final draft, or a process-oriented approach, working with the writer throughout the writing process, from idea to final draft. In the questionnaire, these methods were described rather than labeled "product-oriented" and "process-oriented" because these are pedagogical terms and are not commonly used in the industry. A third choice was: "It depends on the writer. I use both approaches."

Most of the editors responded they use both methods, depending on the writer, and they said this holds true for both staff writers and free-lance writers. One business editor elaborated, saying his method depends on the "background and experience of the writer, [both] in our industry and as a writer." This result, showing editors vary their method depending on the writer, differed from an earlier study of magazine educators, which determined that the process method is the dominant teaching method in magazine journalism courses (Schierhorn and Endres, 1992).

In the current study, there was no statistical difference between publication types or between men and women in the response to this question about method of editing. The finding in regard to men and women is consistent with an earlier study (Endres and Schierhorn, 1992) that found male and female magazine educators teach in a similar manner.

Table 3

Methods Editors Use to Work with Writers

	Consumer Editors		Business Editors	
	Freelance	Staff	Freelance	Staff
	Percent Using Each Method			
Assign/edit	45.6	39.8	40.1	24.2
Work in stages	6.5	3.6	4.2	6.8
Depends	47.8	56.6	55.6	68.9

Research Question 3: Why does the editor use the method he or she does?

Most of the editors responded that they used the method they did because of their experience as an editor. There was no statistical difference in consumer and business publications in the editors' responses to this question (62.6 percent of the consumer editors and 62.4. percent of the business editors).

There was, however, a statistically significant difference in the reason editors functioned as they did when the answers were analyzed by gender. While the largest number of men and women responding credited editing experience as their reason for how they work with writers, women were far more apt to credit journalism experience as well. (See Table 4.) Because women in this survey had less editing experience than men, it is reasonable to expect this difference in orientation.

In the earlier study on methods of writing instruction used by journalism and mass communications professors (Endres and Schierhorn), men and women reported different reasons for selecting their method of instruction as well. Men attributed their teaching method to professional journalism experience, and women attributed their method to their teaching experience.

Table 4

Editors' Reasons for Method of Editing

	Male	Female
Editing Experience	84 (69.4%)	41 (51.9%)
Journalism Experience	21 (17.4%)	25 (31.6%)
Other	16 (13.2%)	13 (16.5%)

X2=6.8685343, df=2, p<.05

Research Question 4: How is the editor using the method?

For this question, editors were asked a series of questions to determine what they require of writers throughout the writing process and when they confer with writers during the process. The stages in the writing process identified in earlier studies are idea, reporting, organizing, writing and rewriting. Editors were asked if they required a concept memo from staff writers and a query letter from free-lance writers to represent the idea stage. They were asked if they required a list of sources to determine if they required information on reporting, and they were asked if they required an outline to find out if they sought information on organizing. The editors were asked if they required a first draft (the writing stage) and a rewrite or rewrites (the rewriting stage). In addition, the editors were asked whether they conferred with staff writers and free-lancers at each of these stages. The questions were asked separately for staff writers and free-lance writers because editors might handle these writers differently.

The results showed no statistical difference between consumer and business magazines in how editors work with staff writers, but there are some statistically significant

differences in how they work with free-lancers. These differences revolved around the idea and organizing stages. Consumer magazine editors were more likely by a statistically significant margin to require a query letter than business editors. This may be because business editors work with a small cadre of freelance writers who are experts in the field. One business editor wrote: "For feature articles, I work almost exclusively with a small group of tried and true free-lancers. Part of my strategy is to build experts, either on staff or free-lance, that my readers can expect to see." Business magazine editors were more likely to require an outline from writers, especially freelance writers, than were consumer editors. One business editor who required this information about story organization commented it was the key to good copy.

Most editors *conferred* with writers on the concept and again at the draft stage. Consumer editors were more likely, on a statistically significant level, to confer on the concept than were business editors. However, business editors were more likely, again on a statistically significant level, to confer on the outline. Most editors indicated they were not working with writers one-on-one during reporting and organizing. Many noted that they thought this approach would be more time-consuming. A consumer editor who uses a product-oriented approach wrote it "seems the most efficient use of time at this magazine." A business editor said, "I don't have time to train/coax/nurture (unfortunately) writers." Another consumer editor commented, "Our writers work very independently." This product-oriented approach is consistent with the role of the editor outlined by Click and Baird. They see the editor as the evaluator of ideas and manuscripts. It differs from the collaborative role of the editor promulgated by Clark and Fry and by Jacobi.

Some editors seemed to avoid contact with writers. A consumer editor said, "I buy ready-to-go articles." Another wrote, "I approve final versions, editing [staff writers] only when necessary." A business editor,who also seemed to avoid contact, wrote, "They come up with their own ideas and do them." Another business editor said, "Staff writers edit their own copy."

With the exception of the outline, freelance writers received less feedback than staff writers in this study. One consumer editor remarked about free-lance writers: "I never confer. I edit and rewrite." That lack of feedback may be partially a function of access; free-lancers generally work in a different location from editors. However, several consumer editors noted an additional reason for lack of contact with free-lancers in the writing process. These editors use unsolicited manuscripts. For that reason, they have no contact with writers in the first four stages of the writing process.

Despite editors' reporting that their editing method depended on the writer, some overall patterns emerged. Although it was not statistically significant, business editors were more closely involved with free-lance and staff writers throughout the writing process, while consumer editors emphasized concept memos/queries and drafts, a product-oriented approach.

Table 5

Material Required/Conferring by Type of Publication

	Consumer Editors		Business Editors	
	Freelance	**Staff**	**Freelance**	**Staff**
Material Required In Writing Stages				
Memo/Query	70.6%	32.2%	44.1%*	28.8%
Source list	26.1	20.7	25.0	23.2
Outline	18.5	13.8	31.6	16.0
First draft	56.5	62.1	59.6	62.4
Rewrite	66.3	65.5	59.6	74.4
Conferring In Writing Stages				
Concept/Query	78.7**	79.3	55.8	88.3
Source list	11.2	21.8	29.7	48.4
Outline	20.2	16.1	36.2***	24.2
First draft	56.2	59.8	65.9	68.0
Rewrite	67.4	72.4	63.0	78.6

*X2= 15.600445, df=1, p<.001

**X2=12.38883239, df=1, p<.001
***X2=6.6070045, df=1, p<.02

When the data were analyzed for gender differences, two interesting differences emerged. Men were more likely than women to require a rewrite from staff writers, and women were less apt than men to hold conferences during the outline stage. This latter finding was consistent with the earlier study on gender and magazine teaching (Endres and Schierhorn), which showed that women were less likely to hold conferences on writing assignments outside the classroom, but not at a statistically significant level.

Table 6

Material Required/Conferring by Gender

	Female		Male	
	Freelance	**Staff**	**Freelance**	**Staff**
Material Required In Writing Stages				
Memo/Query	51.7%	21.1%	56.7%	35.3%
Source list	25.3	22.4	25.5	22.1
Outline	25.3	10.5	27.0	17.6
First draft	64.4	69.7	57.4	58.1
Rewrite	64.4	69.7	61.0	71.3
Conferring In Writing Stages				
Memo/Query	62.8	85.9	66.0	83.9
Source list	25.6	39.7	20.6	36.5
Outline	23.3	12.8	34.0	25.5
First draft	68.6	69.2	58.2	62.0
Rewrites	65.1	76.9	64.2	73.7

These questions about how editors work with writers revealed that the method they report using is not necessarily borne out by how they report they operationalize that method. Editors were working with writers during the writing process more than they seemed to acknowledge.

Research Question 5: How are staff or free-lance writers interacting with other members of a creative team?

Editors were asked to note when staff writers and when free-lance writers at their magazine begin to work with other members of a creative team, such as photographers, artists and designers. They were asked whether writers work with the team from conceptualization,

while a story is in progress or when the story is completed. One business editor acknowledged the importance of the relationship between the text and the visual presentation, saying, "Staff writers/free-lancers/editors *must* be multi-talented and have full knowledge of computer/printing and graphic technology."

On the largest circulating magazines, the staff writer is likely to be most fully integrated into the creative team. Half of the editors working on the largest magazines (200,000+ circulation) involve staff writers in the creative team from the moment of the story's conception. Smaller publications are less apt to do so.[9]

The largest number of the editors of smaller magazines (those with a circulation of less than 200,000) reported that they were only likely to include the staff writer into the creative team once the story was underway or once it was completed. A large minority of the editors of smaller magazines, however, did not include the staff writer in the creative team at all.

Table 7

Staff Writers Involved in the Creative Team By Circulation Size

	From Concept	In Progress	Story Complete	Not At All
Less than 25,000	18 (21.2%)	35 (41.2)	12 (14.1)	20 (25.5)
25,000-74,999	14 (23.7)	19 (32.2)	17 (28.8)	9 (15.3)
75,000-199,999	10 (25.0)	15 (37.5)	9 (22.5)	6 (15.0)
200,000+	13 (50.0)	5 (19.2)	7 (26.9)	1 (3.8)

X2=4.33260, df=9, ns

Whether or not the writer is integrated into the creative team, he or she is still expected to carry out many of the requirements commonly associated with working on a creative team. For example, the majority of the editors reported they expected writers to write to a specific length. However, there were variations based on magazine size. For example, the

editors of the largest magazines (N=20, or 64.5 percent) were more likely to require this than the editors of the smallest magazines (N=30, or 40 percent).[10] The majority of the editors also required that writers do sidebars and charts developed to go along with a story's layout. The vast majority of the editors required this no matter what the size of the magazine: 89.1 percent of the editors with magazines of circulation of less than 25,000; 91.7 percent of those on magazines in the 25,000 to 74,999 range; 95.6 percent of those with circulations of 75,000 to 199,999; and 93.5 percent with circulations in excess of 200.000.

Male editors were more likely than female editors to include staff writers in a creative team at some point during story development, but not by a statistically significant margin. Perhaps this is because they are more experienced editors. Men were also more likely to include free-lance writers in the creative team, this time by a statistically significant margin.[11] The tendency of free-lancers to be less involved in the creative process than staff writers seemed to have several causes. First, free-lancers usuallly work at another location and lack easy access to the editorial office. Second, as one consumer editor pointed out, if these writers are selling completing manuscripts without writing a query letter first, they cannot be involved in the creative team during story development. In some other cases, the fact that a magazine reported not using a creative team approach seemed to stem from limited resources. Several consumer and business editors expected writers to provide their own photos, so two aspects of the creative team were folded into one contributor. One business editor reported having no photographers, artists or designers on staff. At another business magazine, the editor also was the art director.

Table 8

Editor's Gender by Free-lancers in Creative Team

	Male	Female
From Concept	28 (20.7%)	4 (4.7%)
In Progress	28 (20.7%)	13 (15.3%)
Story Completed	8 (5.9%)	9 (10.6%)
Not at all	71 (52.6%)	59 (69.4%)

X2=17.86256, df=3, p<.001

Research Question 6: Has the use of free-lance writers changed in the past five years?

The respondents indicated their magazines are increasingly relying on free-lance writers (57.8 percent of the consumer magazines and 53.9 percent of the business magazines had more free-lance writers than five years ago). However, a minority of respondents said that they had cut back on the number of free-lancers (20.2 percent of the consumer editors, 26.2 percent of the business editors).

Some editors commented they rely solely on free-lance writers and themselves for copy. One consumer editor reported, "Our company publishes six automotive magazines with a small core of staff writers/photographers and a large network of free-lancers." A business editor predicted, "In five years, we will see fewer staff writers and more editorial produced by free-lancers."

Along with these questions on use of free-lance writers, the editors were asked how they pay free-lancers. The most common method of payment was by the piece (73.6 percent of consumer editors and 66.9 percent of business editors). On business magazines, 21.1 percent of the editors indicated they pay other than by the piece, word, day or inch. Some of those editors who checked "other" noted they paid by the printed page or on a contract basis. Several commented that the quality of the work or the complexity of the story was a factor in

payment. However, the majority of those business editors responding "other" reported they simply did not compensate these writers at all. "Free-lancers are not paid," one editor wrote. "They benefit from the exposure." None of the consumer editors who checked "other" as a method of payment reported using unpaid freelance writers. They reported either paying by the printed page or depending on the quality of the story.

Table 9

Freelance Pay by Type of Magazine

	Consumer	**Business**
Word	17(18.7%)	10 (7.5%)
Piece	67 (73.6)	89 (66.9)
Other	7 (7.7)	34 (25.6)

X2=19.25154 , df=2, p<.001

Conclusion

In this study, consumer and business magazine editors, both men and women, say they chose their editing methods on an *ad hoc* basis, switching between a product-oriented approach and a process-oriented approach, depending on the writer. This study then indicates that despite its dominance in magazine writing instruction, the process approach has not become the dominant editing method in the industry, although a minority of editors do interact with writers throughout the writing process. This is particularly interesting because the process approach is widely discussed under the name of coaching in the newspaper industry. Why magazine journalists have not embraced the idea further merits additional study. Whether it is actually being used -- or just talked out -- in the newspaper industry also merits consideration. In addition, the concept of the creative team is not as widely embraced as might be expected by discussion of this approach at industry conferences. This concept, too, merits further study to determine if it will become more widely accepted. Editors in this study indicate

they are relying increasingly on free-lancers, but, at the same time, they are less likely to work with free-lancers than with staff writers during the writing process and less likely to involve free-lancers in a creative team. The free-lancers' status as second-class citizens warrants consideration in further research.

References

Abrahamson, D. (1991, November). *The Role of Reader Gender as an Economic Determinant in U.S. Consumer Magazines*. Paper presented at the mid-year meeting of the Magazine Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Oxford, MS.

Berner, R. T. (1991). *The Process of Editing*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Clark, R. P. and Fry, D. (1992). *Coaching writers: Editors and Reporters Working Together.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Click, J. W. and Baird, R. N. (1990). *Magazine Editing and Production*, 5th ed. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown.

Covey, R. (1992, July). Presentation at Design Studio Tour, Folio: Washington, D.C. magazine publishing conference.

Endres, K. L. and Schierhorn, A. B. (1992, August). *Closing the gap: An analysis of gender-based differences and similarities in magazine-writing instruction.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Magazine Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Montreal.

Green, D. (1992, July). Presentation at Design Studio Tour, Folio: Washington, D.C. magazine publishing conference.

Jacobi, P. (1991). *The Magazine Article: How to Think It, Plan It, Write It* . Cincinnati, Ohio: Writer's Digest Books.

Kobak, J. B. (1990, March). 25 years of change. *Folio*, pp. 82-89.

Kobak , J. B. (1993). Magazine trends. *Sourcebook 1993, Folio*, pp. 235-239.

Laakaniemi, R. (1987). An analysis of writing coach programs on American daily newspapers. *Journalism Quarterly, 64*(2-3), 569-575.

The New Yorker. (1986). *Writers and Artist* [videotape]. New York: The New Yorker Magazine, Inc.

Pace, E. (1992, December 9). William Shawn, 85, is dead; New Yorker's gentle despot. *The New York Times*, pp. A1, A15.

Paul, G. (1991, February). Presentation at Penton Publishing, Cleveland, Ohio.

Schierhorn, A.B. and Endres, K.L. (1992), Magazine writing instruction and the composition revolution. *Journalism Educator, 47* (2), 57-64.

Stamell, M. (1990, December). How can we coach magazine writers? *The Coaches' Corner*, 10

Standard Rate and Data Services (1992, March). *Consumer Magazine and Agri-Media Rates and Data.*

Standard Rate and Data Services (1992, April). *Business Publication Rates and Data, I and II.*

Thurber, J. (1957). *The Years with Ross*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Wolf, R. and Thomason, T. (1986). Writing coaches: Their strategies for improving writing. *Newspaper Research Journal, 7*, 43-49.

1Schierhorn and Endres (1992).

2 All duplicate listings of the same periodical within the SRDS volume and between SRDS volumes were excluded from this study. Where duplication was found, researchers placed the periodical in its most appropriate population, based on content and audience. Some periodicals issue special daily publications to cover a trade show or convention. These listings and periodicals were excluded from the sample because of the nature of the publication and because most "show" issues share the editorial staff of the regularly appearing periodical, which was included. Some periodicals now offer annual or semi-annual buyer's guides or directories, which are often issued under a different name and have a separate listing in SRDS but share the editorial staff of the issuing publication. In these cases, the buyer's guide was excluded, but the regularly appearing publication was included. A number of entertainment programs are now listed in the consumer volume of Standard Rate and Data. These were excluded.

3 Eleven questionnaires were unusable. Most of these were from refereed journals, which are not included in this study.

4 X2 for age groupings= 19.58889, df=4, p<.001.

5 X2 for education groupings= 4.583663, df=3, p=n.s.

6 X2 for journalism experience groupings =20.797406, df=6, p<.01

7 X2 for editing experience groupings= 18.132782, df=3, p<.001.

8 X2 for staff writer groupings= 5.9311927, df=3, p=n.s.

9 X2=18.49859, df=9, p<.05.

[10] Differences were not large enough to be statistically significant. $X2=7.675772$, $df=3$, $p=.053221$

[11] $X2= 17.86256$, $df=3$, $p<.001$